

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-26, and 28-32 are pending. Claims 1-4, 16, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 11-13, 26, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 5, 17, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 6-10, 15, 18-21, 25, 28, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 14, 19, and 27 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 16, and 20 are currently amended.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-10 are amended to recite a "Bluetooth transmitting device" rather than a "transmitting packet communication device." This limitation is similar to the limitation of original claim 6, which Examiner indicates is allowable subject matter. Modifiers "packet" and "communication" are redundant and are deleted to agree with respective depending claims. Thus, applicants believe claims 1-10, as amended, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 16 is amended to include the limitations of original claim 19, which Examiner indicates is allowable subject matter. Claim 19 is cancelled. Thus, applicants believe claims 16-18 and 20-22, as amended, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Examiner has rejected independent claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Perlman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,450,407). Claim 23 recites "A packet communication apparatus for receiving a packet of information from a further packet communication apparatus, the packet having a plurality of fields including a predetermined address field for carrying address information indicative of an intended recipient of the packet, comprising: a communication interface for receiving the packet via a communication link; and *an address decoder coupled to said communication interface for detecting in said predetermined address field information which indicates that a further field of the packet contains address information* from which the intended recipient of the packet can be determined." (emphasis added). Examiner indicates column 4, lines 6-10 of Perlman et al. discloses such a decoder. Applicants respectfully disagree. Perlman et al. fail to disclose a decoder anywhere in their specification. The phrase "the indicator capable of being interpreted by a receiving station" does not disclose that the indicator is encoded

or that the receiving station decodes the indicator. Even if the indicator is decoded, there is nothing to suggest it is accomplished by an address decoder as in the present invention. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants further submit that claims 24-25 are also patentable as depending from claim 23.

Claims 11-13, 26, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sharpe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,094,146). Independent claim 11 recites "providing identification information which identifies a recipient packet communication device for which the packet is intended; *responsive to the identification information*, a transmitting packet device producing address information indicative of the intended recipient device and *extending the address field of the packet to accommodate the address information* and providing the address information in the extended address field." Independent claim 26 recites "*a packet processor for selectively extending said address field of the packet to accommodate said address information*, said packet processor further for providing said address information in said extended address field." (emphasis added). As best applicants understand the disclosure of Sharpe, the extended address field (EAF) of Figure 3a is always present. It is not extended in response to identification information (claim 11) or selectively extended by a packet processor (claim 26). Thus applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-13 and 26 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Sharpe.

Independent claim 29 recites "a packet processor coupled to said communication interface for *using error check information* from the received packet to *determine whether the address field of the received packet is an extended length address field*." Examiner has identified the disclosure of CRC bits at column 1, lines 33-37. However, Examiner has failed to identify any disclosure that these CRC bits are used to determine whether the address field is an extended length address field as in claim 29. By way of contrast, Sharpe teaches that "Extended Addresses are identified by enabled pagers as the first two digits of the message following the address code word." (col. 4, lines 32-34). Sharpe would not also use error check information for the same purpose. Thus applicants respectfully submit that claims 29-32 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Sharpe.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-26, and 28-32. If the Examiner finds any issue that is unresolved, please call applicants' attorney by dialing the telephone number printed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert N. Rountree
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 39,347

Robert N. Rountree, LLC
70360 Highway 69
Cotopaxi, CO 81223
Phone/Fax: (719) 783-0990